



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It would be impossible with the ordinary limits of a review to characterize the work as a whole more precisely. It is not extravagant to predict that it will mark a distinct stage in the evolution of sociology. Its type of analysis must be adopted into our procedure. As indicated above, this judgment is quite independent of the question whether there is much or little to be said for Simmel's attempt to confine the application of the title "Sociology" to the particular sort of analysis of which he was the first to show the importance.

ALBION W. SMALL

New Worlds for Old. By H. G. WELLS. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 333. \$1.50.

One socialist does not make socialism any more than one swallow makes a summer. If all socialists had the broadmindedness and the vision of Mr. Wells, much that characterized historical socialism would never have been. He sees clearly that socialism is conditioned by a growth of intelligence and social conscience much beyond the present stage of development. He rejoices in every enlargement of governmental function because he believes, not only that in that way socialism will be brought nearer, but also that the present evil conditions will be ended. He is sane also in his appreciation of the benefits, historically considered, of the present stage of civilization as contrasted with that of the past. It is the best in many respects which has ever been. The present régime is a necessary, though transitory, step to a better, viz., socialism. Private property is not theft to him, as it was to Proudhon; the family does not need to be abolished—only mended; competition is not to be destroyed—simply limited in its scope to fame, service, position, authority, leisure, love, and honor (p. 107). Thus far Mr. Wells, the student of history and the man of compromise.

In spite of all this, connecting so naturally with the present state of things, there constantly appears a spirit of protest against the present system. This appears in two aspects: (1) hot revolt against the injustices of our present system, against the evils incident to our social organization, evils bewailed as earnestly by the most earnest advocates of the system as by its enemies; (2) against the very foundations of the system.

If brilliant indictment of the evils attending the present régime were sufficient ground for condemning it, certainly we all should

join him, for Mr. Wells lays them bare with a hand which spares nothing. The individuals who are the scapegoats of our present organization of society, who vicariously pay the costs of progress in themselves and their families, have yet to find a more eloquent champion of their wrongs. Against these incidental evils Mr. Wells cries out with passionate earnestness.

From this, however, he passes over at once to a condemnation of the competitive system and a glorification of socialism as a scheme which would do away with all the ills and have more than all the benefits of the former. The chief trouble with the present system is an exaggeration of the idea of property (p. 85). "Land, all raw materials, all values and resources accumulated from the past" must be owned and administrated by the community as a whole (p. 86). As a result the present waste will be stopped and the people will receive vastly more of all things than possible now. The spirit of service will displace as a motive to activity the present lure of gain, while making labor vastly more productive.

That is the second great generalization of socialism. The first is like unto it. The state will take control of the family in the interest of womanhood and childhood. It will free the family from its present proprietary status and make it a union of equals. Children will be born only of such people as are fitted to produce and train citizens of the best type.

How the abolition of private property in the things mentioned will increase its productiveness and insure its proper distribution; how the state will bring it about that only the right kind of couples will produce children and that these couples shall not only be healthy but wise, or else commit the training of the children to those who are wise, and how the latter shall be selected; how men shall become such that they will prefer work to leisure; how the spirit of service shall supplant the lure of gain in the average man, Mr. Wells does not inform us, unless it be in those passages where he says socialism must wait upon education. But, if education can make men such as socialism demands for its success, all that is needed is extension of our present system in scope and method. And if such men may be produced by such means, and if socialism must wait until such are brought forth by the present system, is it not probable that socialism would not be needed to cure our ills? They would cure themselves with such people populating the world.

Moreover, Mr. Wells fails to break away from the old socialists

in his economic theory. He shows the same lack of understanding of present social and economic science as his more rabid brethren. For example, he shows no comprehension of the law of population when he suggests that the state pension every mother; he manifests no conception of the theory of wages when he assumes that a worker by working harder and producing more makes life harder for another worker (p. 295); of the theory of rent when he says rent is fixed by what people will give (p. 307). He makes sheer assumptions in saying the nationalization of property would greatly increase the production of the world (p. 55), that there is now and would continue to be under socialism enough to house and feed the population of the world (p. 59). One might ask, What population? That now existing or that which would exist when a premium was put upon increase of population by means of a pension to motherhood? He assumes that prices are fixed by the avarice of owners and ability of the buyer to pay (p. 64), that a profit is levied upon the poor for which the *entrepreneur* has given no utility in return, that the evils incident to stock-watering are necessary to private ownership (p. 73 ff). It is worth while, furthermore, to suggest, in antithesis to his assumption that every effort to regulate the powers of great wealth so as to abolish abuses is socialistic, that, perhaps, such a thing is a chief means of preserving the competitive system. The trouble with Mr. Wells is that he has attempted in this book to ride two horses going in opposite directions, competition and socialism. He decries the competitive system in some things and retains it in others. In one breath he tells us that "self-interest never took a man or a community to any other end than damnation," while in the next he says that men shall be left to seek their self-interest in such things as fame, honor, leisure, etc. Has he failed to see that most of the evils incident to seeking for gain today rest upon desire of social prominence in fame, honor, leisure, etc.?

Mr. Wells has told us well what our troubles are, a thing we are well aware of already. We shall need some other man, however, to tell us how to cure them than Mr. Wells with his advice to let the present system produce a social conscience and character and then adopt socialism as the panacea.

J. L. GILLIN